

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.

1301 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1000 WEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3317

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
PETER W. HUBER
MARK C. HANSEN
K. CHRIS TODD
MARK L. EVANS
AUSTIN C. SCHLICK
STEVEN F. BENZ

(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

NEIL M. GORSUCH
GEOFFREY M. KLINEBERG
REID M. FIGEL
HENK BRANDS
SEAN A. LEV
COURTNEY SIMMONS ELWOOD
EVAN T. LEO

Redacted – For Public Inspection

March 1, 2000

Ex Parte Submission

Magalie Roman Salas, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
MAR 01 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: *Application of SBC Communications Inc. Pursuant to Section 271 of the
Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA
Services in Texas, CC Docket No. 00-4*

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed for filing under seal please find a confidential version of page 42 of the Reply Affidavit of William Dysart (originally filed on February 22, 2000). At the request of a Texas CLEC, a redacted replacement for this page is being filed for the public record. Please substitute the redacted page for the original in the Commission's public files and Internet postings.

Copies of this letter and the redacted page are being provided to all parties to whom Southwestern Bell provided the Dysart reply affidavit. We hereby request that all parties substitute the new page and destroy the old page. In addition, we are requesting that ITS provide copies of this letter and the redacted page to all parties to whom it furnished copies of the Dysart reply affidavit. Southwestern Bell has corrected its own Internet posting.

An original and two copies of this cover letter and the redacted page are being submitted for inclusion in the public record. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,



Austin C. Schlick

No. of Copies rec'd 0+2
List ABCDE

cc: Ms. Myles
Ms. Stephens
Ms. Wright
Ms. Farroba, Texas PUC
Ms. Heisler, DOJ
ITS
Recipients of February 22 filing

suppositions regarding anticompetitive activities.⁷⁰ Alternatively, attention might be directed toward that measure (or group of measures) a particular CLEC finds troublesome. SWBT will investigate and/or reconcile reported data with CLECs that notify SWBT regarding potential data problems.

XI) CLEC DISAGREEMENTS WITH MEASUREMENT RESULTS ARE INCORRECT

92. Covad claims that SWBT returned FOCs within 4 days on 69.47% of LSRs in November and 52.98% in December. SWBT's FOC data demonstrates a completely different reality from what Covad has alleged. This data shows the actual FOCs returned within 4 days of 97.9% in November and 95.1% in December.

Month	Total LSRs	FOCs w/ 1 days	FOCs w/ 2 days	FOCs w/ 3 days	FOCs w/ 4 days	FOCs w/ 5 days	FOCs w/ 6 days	FOCs > 6 days
November	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		67.7%	90.3%	95.9%	97.9%	98.5%	99.0%	1.0%
December	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
		49.9%	77.1%	89.4%	95.1%	97.4%	97.7%	2.3%

93. A sample of PON data contained in the affidavit of Candy Conway may reveal the discrepancy. Covad appears to be recording the day they receive the FOC from their fax machine instead of the day that SWBT transmits the FOC. The business rule clearly defines the end time as "the actual dates and times the faxes are sent back to the CLEC."

⁷⁰ AT&T's view that SWBT merely presents excuses is incorrect. See, AT&T's Pfau and DeYoung ¶ 70, n.82.